

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

SCOTT RODDAN.

Plaintiff,

V.

RUSSELL ALTMAN, LLC, a Nevada Corporation; BENEFICIAL SOLUTIONS, LLC, a Nevada Corporation; and RUSSELL ALTMAN, individually,

## Defendants.

NO. 2:15-CV-00220-JLO

## ORDER RE: STIPULATION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

On March 8, 2016, the parties filed a Stipulation for Protective Order (ECF No. 35). The Stipulation for Protective Order seeks the court's approval and entry of a protective order. The request for entry of a protective order is Denied.

The Stipulation for Protective Order defines “Confidential” as financial documents designated as confidential by the party. (ECF No. 35 at 2). The Stipulation provides for the handling of “confidential” documents, accessing those documents, and requiring a “written assurance” from each person designated to receive “confidential” documents to comply with the terms of the stipulation. *See* (ECF No. 35 at 3-5). Third parties are granted the ability to designate documents as “confidential.” *See* (ECF No. 35 at 4).

It is this court’s general policy not to enter “blanket” protective orders. The Ninth Circuit also generally does not approve of “blanket” protective orders. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1130-31 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) (finding it could not sustain the district court’s blanket protective order because the district court did not require a specific showing as to particular documents). Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(c) provides that

1 upon a showing of "good cause" the court may enter a protective order. "A party  
2 asserting good cause bears the burden, for each particular document it seeks to protect, of  
3 showing that specific prejudice or harm will result if no protective order is granted."  
4 *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1130. No documents have been provided to the court for a  
5 determination of whether good cause exists for a protective order. Such an order is not  
6 necessary in view of the agreement of the parties as to the handling of confidential  
7 material.

8 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

9 1. The Stipulation for Protective Order (ECF No. 35) is **DENIED**.  
10 2. The parties are free to make arrangements concerning the conduct and use of  
11 discovery, and have so agreed in their Stipulation for Protective Order. The  
12 denial of court participation in the agreement between the parties shall not  
13 affect the validity of the agreement. The parties have stipulated to terms and  
14 conditions to maintain the confidentiality of certain documents. Should the  
15 parties have need (despite redactions) to file any documents under seal, they  
16 may do so along with a motion to seal. The court will then determine if it is  
17 appropriate to seal the documents. The parties shall also comply with  
18 Fed.R.Civ.P. 5.2 concerning privacy protections for filings made with the  
19 court.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk is hereby directed to enter this Order and  
21 furnish copies to counsel.

22 **DATED** this 9<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2016.

23 s/ Justin L. Quackenbush  
24 JUSTIN L. QUACKENBUSH  
25 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

ORDER - 3